

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-21 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,092,114 (Shaffer, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,549,918 (Probert, Jr. et al.) and further in view of a document titled "Conversion Service" (CERN). Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 20 and 21 were not rejected over the prior art, though.

The rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully traversed. Applicants ask that Claim 20 be amended to address the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

For the reasons discussed below, Claims 20 and 21 satisfy the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, and all of Claims 1-5 and 7-21 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, accordingly, respectfully requested to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 and the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, and to allow Claims 1-5 and 7-21.

In rejecting Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the Examiner specifically objected to two limitations in Claim 20 – the user entering into the first database information identifying compressed text that needs to be converted into post script format; and the universal server checking the license agreement to determine if compilation of the given program into a second source code is allowable. The Examiner argued that the specification fails to discuss these steps.

In order to overcome this objection, these steps are being removed from Claim 20. It is believed that this overcomes the rejection of Claim 20 and the rejection of Claim 21, which is dependent from Claim 20, under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The changes requested herein to Claim 20 do not raise any new issues, do not add any material to the claim, and do not require any additional searching. In contrast, these changes eliminate issues by removing the steps to which the Examiner objected. Consequently, it is believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate; and the Examiner is, thus, asked to enter this Amendment, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 20 and 21 were not rejected over the prior art, and these claims also patentably distinguish over the prior art.

In addition, the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully traversed because the prior art does not disclose or suggest using a computer, first, to determine if a file is compatible with the computer's operating system, and second, using that same computer to transmit the data file over the Internet to a universal server for conversion, as described in independent Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12.

In order to best understand this, it may be helpful to review briefly the present invention and the prior art.

This invention, generally, relates to methods and systems for allowing a computer to work with input data that is in a format nominally incompatible with the operating system for the computer. In accordance with the instant invention, if a data file is not compatible with the computer's operating system, the file is transmitted over the Internet to a remote Universal Server, which transforms the data file into a format compatible with the computer's operating system.

The data file may be transformed in several ways. For example, the Universal Server may be provided with a module having a set, or library, of source codes, and the Universal

Server may obtain from this module the source code for the data file, and use this source code to transform the data file.

In preferred embodiments of the invention, the Universal Server may perform several functions. For instance, this Server may define automatically what changes are needed to a given program and how that program should be changed, and may define the type of data in the given program and the operating system for which the program was formatted. Also, this Server may check to determine what operating system is on the computer and what applications are on that computer to process the type of data in the given program.

In accordance with the invention, the computer is used, first, to determine if a file is compatible with the computer's operating system, and second, to transit that data file over the Internet to the Universal Server. The prior art, as mentioned above, does not teach or suggest this use of the computer.

Probert, Jr., et al. describes an operating system layer between software components or application programs that expect information to be in one format and a persistent store manager of the operating system that maintains the information in this persistent state. This operating system is used to provide "on the fly" transformation between the file format expected by the application layer and the format used by the persistent store manager. The express teaching of Probert, Jr. et al, thus, is to provide this conversion software on the computer, and not on a remote server.

Shaffer, et al. describes a method and system for exchanging electronic messages. With the process disclosed in Shaffer, et al, however, the data is not sent to a server by a computer that earlier received the file and determined that the file was not compatible with the computer's operating system. For example, the Abstract of Shaffer, et al. states that "If it is determined that

a file format conversion is required, the conversion operation is assigned to a server..." Shaffer, et al. does not disclose that the computer, which has found the data file incompatible, sends the actual data file to the conversion server.

CERN was cited in the Office Action for its teaching of allowing users to upload files over the Internet from a user's station to be converted. Among other differences between the present invention and CERN, this reference does not disclose using the computer to determine that the file is not compatible with the computer's operating system. Instead, with the CERN procedure, the computer user determines what files to send for conversion.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 clearly set forth the above-discussed difference between the present invention and the prior art. Specifically, Claims 1 and 12 describe the features that the computer determines whether the format of the file is compatible with the computer operating system, and if the data file is not compatible with the computer, that computer transmits that data file over the Internet from the computer to a universal server, which then transforms the file into a format compatible with the computer.


Claim 7, similarly, describes the feature that a computer determines if data, entered into the computer, is compatible with the operating system in the computer, and if the format of that data is not compatible with that computer, that computer sends that data over a network to a remote universal driver, which then reformats that data into a format compatible with the computer. Claim 8, which is directed to a system for re-formatting computer files, includes apparatus limitations analogous to the method features described above in connection with Claims 1 and 12.

The other references of record, whether considered individually or in combination, are believed to be no more pertinent than Shaffer, et al, Probert, Jr., et al, and CERN.

In light of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is obvious in view of that prior art. Hence, Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-5 and 17-21 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Also, Claims 9-11 are dependent from Claim 8 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 13-15 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 12.

For the reasons set forth above, this application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112. The Examiner is further asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-5 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow these claims and Claims 20 and 21. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
JSS:jy